

JAN  
17 December 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Security (PSI)

SUBJECT : Office of Security Support to Agency  
Recruiters - Project RESISTANCE

1. A review of the Office of Security files concerning security support to the Office of Personnel recruiters reflects that this activity started in February 1967 when the then Deputy Director for Support directed the Office of Security to assist the Office of Personnel recruiters in view of the ongoing harassment of Agency recruiters in various colleges and universities... Tab A gives a general summary on the background of the problem and details some of the activities that took place. Tab B is a summary of the manhours expended by the various field offices in support of this effort. In December 1970 the requirement for security support in the recruiting activity was curtailed to a great extent due to the smaller quotas required of the recruiters and the fact that interviews could be arranged through campus contacts.

2. A complete review of the files reflects that the support to the recruiters took the form of direct support on the campus, arranging for alternate interviews in federal buildings near the campus, checking with campus officials and local police units in advance of the recruiters visit to determine the extent of any dissident protest on the day of the recruiters visit, and coordination with various organizations such as the FBI, State and local police, and military intelligence organizations to provide advance warning of anticipated trouble on the campus.

3. A complete list of the colleges and universities visited by the Office of Security representatives, the date of the visit and a brief summary of the type of support rendered, is summarized in the attached report. No incidents or publicity occurred as a result of this support.

Deputy Chief  
Staff and Operations Branch

CONFIDENTIAL

208

## OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR RECRUITMENT

In February 1967 the DDS directed the Office of Security to assist the Office of Personnel Recruiting Division in any way possible. This was based primarily on a recruiter being held a prisoner at Columbia University for several hours. The instructions to the field offices presented a great deal of a challenge due to the fact that the recruiters are open and field offices are under cover. However previously the recruiter based his predictions of difficulty on his own experiences, contact with DCS and information he could get from FBI at Washington, D. C. , contact with Security people was forbidden.

Security was first asked to afford available information, make discreet inquiries and to set up space for recruiters in Federal space when trouble was anticipated. Trouble was then defined as violent confrontations; possible physical harm to recruiters and great publicity.

Harrassment developed along the following lines:

Harrassments --

1. Passing out handbills saying "You may have already won"  
Call such & such number which was the recruiter's number.
2. Reporter signing up for employment interviews.
3. Dissidents signing up for employment interviews.
4. Picketing
5. Obscene and threatening phone calls.
6. Sit-ins or Be-ins.

7. Obstructing halls and door ways.
8. Confrontation -- attempting to have dialog with recruiter to explain Government or CIA policy.
9. Actually holding them prisoners.
10. Finally as in Ann Arbor - blowing up the recruiting office.

They threatened entrapment -- getting a female interviewer into a closed room with recruiter, tearing clothing messing her hair and yelling rape -- This fortunately hasn't happened.

Mr. Osborn addressed the September 1968 Recruiters' Conference where he promised them prompt intelligence so as not to walk into a hotbed, a network of field contacts, reliable and quick communications and moral support but no body guards. The official policy for recruiters prompted by the President and the DCI was no eyeball to eyeball confrontations with resulting publicity but to ignore pickets or photos of recruiters and to utilize campus security but leave if that security breaks down. Security was to recommend but ultimate decision to visit a campus remained with recruiter.

This prompted one of the few purely intelligence gathering assignments to the field offices. Restrictions on contacting FBI at local levels were dropped; recruiters, field offices and resident agents were in direct contact.

The field offices responded extremely well. They used existing contacts at the various colleges, developed new informants and came up with information that would indicate that they attended some of the dissident meetings. They developed files on the universities and colleges, came to know all the campus security people, special units in the local and state police as well as other knowledgeable people not further identified.

The field office information combined with the take from Project RESISTANCE explained recently by \_\_\_\_\_ of SAD, has given us the ability to give an excellent prediction on the possible ~~dissident activity at the various campuses prior to a recruiter's scheduled~~ visit.

We have been able to recommend against a recruiter's visit where publicity has occurred on all but one or two cases, which I believe could not have been determined in any event. These were cases where two or three people crawled out of the woodwork apparently operating independently of any organized group and without prior planning.

As Security could only make recommendations against not going to a college there were a few times when Security and recruiters disagreed on the possibility of trouble, one must understand that the more aggressive recruiter wanted to do his job -- didn't want to back down from the creeps, and so forth and it was his decision to go or call it off. When this occurred,

we would send a man to stay on the fringe area, attempt to spot build-ups and advise further action by the recruiter plus communicating the information to Headquarters. On some situations Headquarters was receiving calls every 30 minutes on the actions and a few times where Security decided there was danger in remaining, the information was sent up to [redacted] and a few times to Mr. Osborn who then used his influence to get the recruiter out. Paint and acid was being thrown in some cases bomb threats made against the building.

During the September 1969 Recruiters' Conference the guidelines became more strict to the point that there was to be "no publicity" ~~connected with recruiting. This is almost impossible.~~ Especially in view of the fact that the recruiters' not going to a campus created publicity. We recommended against going to one campus and the recruiter cancelled his trip. The dissidents didn't believe the school officials that the recruiter was not on campus and made a physical search of the school, intending to throw him off bodily. The result was, of course, publicity. It also caused a flurry of memoranda at Headquarters.

With experience we are now avoiding the trouble spots so little publicity is being given recruiters unless they happen to be on campus with Dow or GE who are the primary targets now. Fortunately the black groups have not caused as much trouble. But in the Support to Recruitment, when we do not get publicity is when we are doing the best job. Also we get calls now from other staff people wanting to know the situation at

various schools, on behalf of their attending the school or of interest to their children. Recently DIA, who has experienced some of our difficulties, wanted a briefing on our methods of operation.

When \_\_\_\_\_ Chief, Recruiting Division, recently spoke to the SAC Conference he stated that the bearded ones had at least accomplished one good thing. They had caused Security and Personnel to work more closely together than in the history of the Agency.

---